

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXVII No. 3 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper March/April 1986

JUST AS IF IT MATTERED — WHICH PLATFORM

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

There is an ancient joke about a Blimp General who, wishing to impress his dinner partner — a dizzy blonde — told her proudly, "My grandfather fell at Waterloo." She, very *unimpressed*, replied, "Oh? Which platform?" The persevering General, finding himself seated next to another dizzy blonde at another dinner, opened his campaign by relating the foregoing exchange, to which the second D.B. replied, "How ridiculous! Just as if it mattered — which platform."

I was reminded of this chestnut by the antic exchanges of our "honourable" parliamentarians during the early weeks of this year, whilst in all the hubbub not a "funeral note" was heard as the corpse of British sovereignty was hurried down to what appears to be its burial place in the Chunnel. Whatever platform we "fall" (or are pushed) on, the undertakers are the same firm however unrelated the names of their branches appear to be. International bankers both promote and supply the mausoleums — UNO, NATO, EC and USSR, plus all the smaller cemeteries and crematoria round the world engaged in the business of reducing to worms or ashes the remains of what were once sovereign states.

The present sorry collection of operatives in the Houses of Parliament are all the heirs and successors of the original employees of the Funeral Directors. It is no wonder that they continue for weeks, blaming and accusing one another as to who was allowing what to be sold to whom, when the latest chapter in their joint betrayal of the country and monarch they are paid to serve was being organised and written into the infamous "treasonable treaty" records without a word of emphatic rejection from any one of them.

Never are we allowed to notice in what direction we are being steered whilst it is yet possible to take another course without having to force the driver to make a three-point turn. When we are engaged in unnecessary and/or no-win war, no other distraction is required. (After all, that is what today's wars are for.) Thus, Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt could cook up the abomination of United Nations in perfect (military) secrecy. The "greatest living Englishman who 'did not become His Majesty's

First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" did just that as long as he could. Lord Never-had-it-so-good Stockton, now sorrowfully lamenting the selling of "the family silver" spent *his* time as Premier organising the provision of sufficient quantities of cakes and circuses to keep the mind of the masses off his "Wind of Change" that whistled the Union of South Africa down the road to liberal ruin, and the United Kingdom to accept in silence perforce the organised invasion of unassimilable aliens that continues to compass *our* liberal ruin.

Red Rapport

And what of the so-called "Loyal Opposition"? Anyone who has read Dr. Kitty Little's **Treason at Westminster** knows of Harold Wilson's rapport with the Soviet Union; and where the USSR's technological expertise comes from is no longer a secret at all. *His* sojourn at Number Ten made Red spies redundant. Do all those defections have anything to do with that, Must be difficult to earn your treasonable keep when competing with officially-provided information flowing and piling in quantities to rival the lakes and mountains of more tangible goods. Beef is not the only commodity subject to intervention.

Next on the roll of dishonour is the musical yachtsman Edward Heath, who now croaks his rage at the sale of the British motor industry (what is left of it). In 1972, he not only presided over but manipulated and rode over all opposition to the disposal of the British Isles in the so-called European Economic Community. Thereafter, what had been processions of hearses at intervals, albeit indecent ones, became a shute down which the national corpses were launched like passengers from a crashed Jumbo.

We are indebted to Merlin Rees, erstwhile Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, for reminding us, lately in a "B"BC interview, that we should remember it is Mrs. Thatcher who has, in fact, implemented the Labour policies concerning Rhodesia and Ulster. It was the Tories, not Labour, who had found a *modus*

vivendi with terrorist-harboursing Eire; it was the Tories, not Labour, who had "given independence" to Rhodesia. Hastily he added, "Not that I disagree . . . must give credit where it is due . . ." etc. What an admission! **Candour** readers, however, do not need to be reminded of that. What *we* should remember is that Southern Ireland only became *persona grata* in the Houses of Parliament when her liberal legislation on contraception and abortion became as permissive and self-destructive as that presently ravaging the UK and USA.

How few are prepared to face the facts of an internationalist-run world. Every political party without exception has its imposed role to play. Even the NF or BNP, should either ever prosper and appear likely to "come to power" in the present set-up, will find itself cast as a mere (or perhaps necessary to the enemy) safety-valve, as is Le Pen's Front National in France today.*

The Tories have done their latest requisite stint, i.e. United Europe; positive discrimination in favour of the *minority* of aliens in our midst; and — seal of the deals — the Chunnel. It is time for them to be taken out of the front line. They must build up their tarnished images and there is no better place to do that than in the vociferous ranks of a critical Opposition. In the interest of "Democracy" the Tories must go, before the maltreated majority of "White extremists" becomes articulate on its own behalf. The interest of that as yet inchoate mass must be directed towards the newly bristled Kinnoch broom to replace (temporarily) the somewhat worn post-imperial vacuum-cleaner to sweep up the remnants of demolition.

When one remembers whose fingers are in *every* financial pie, it is salutary to consider that even if it had been decreed that we should be conquered by the Nazis, it follows as night the day that we should still have the equivalent of the creeps of the "B"BC iterating and reiterating the joys of the multi-racial state they would insist we have become.

No! It is not the platform we have to worry about — it is the fall we have to arrest.

* The most recently-to-hand issue of **The Catholic Counter-Reformation in the XXth Century** describes how spokesmen of the French liberal-establishment are beginning to turn from abusing the Front National with anathema in favour of tempting this rapidly-growing movement away from "the auth-

oritarian solution" with the offer of "the democratic debate". Thus, "this terrible FN will be reduced to its role as political party and Le Pen will be brought back to his vocation as republican politician, without further ado." And was that not precisely the fate predicted by AK Chesterton in these columns thirty-two years ago for any body hardy enough to survive the near 100 per cent mortality rate afflicting new political parties purporting to serve nation, race and faith?

We still have a few hard back copies of

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS

a classic of the right

by A. K. CHESTERTON

Obtainable from:

Candour

Forest House, Liss Forest

Hampshire GU33 7DD

£3 — post free in the UK

SOUTH AFRICANS PLEASE NOTE —

Since the rand has been so disastrously devalued, **CANDOUR** would like to help all unenlightened South Africans to know **WHY**.

To this end, we offer a 1986 limited concession to all new subscribers denizenized in South Africa.

Join our readership **NOW** for the cut price of the rand equivalent of **£2**.

Apply at once to:

**Mrs. Pamela Hickman,
34 Zareba Street,
Port Elizabeth 6001.**

CANDOUR'S BEST FRIEND IS DEAD

It is with the deepest sorrow we have to report our "unique supporter" and great friend, Lady Elizabeth Freeman, died immediately after her car crashed off a road in the Isle of Mull on 14th February, 1986.

We have indeed suffered a unique loss. She was not only A. K. Chesterton's first and most generous sponsor at "Candour's" launching in 1953. She has since remained a constant friend to the present editor and an unfailing prop to the right cause. Like St. Paul, she certainly "fought the good fight" to the end and will surely now claim her victor's crown. We, at least, are left with an inspiring memorial in her "book of wisdom" whose first edition, alas, she did not live to see. She wanted it published "for her grandchildren": it is up to us to make as sure as we can that hers and everybody's grandchildren have the best opportunity to have and to hold the guide to right living assembled by one so well-loved whose own life was so well-lived.

May her soul and the souls of all the faithful departed rest in peace. Amen.

ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE.

THE PITILESS LIBERAL

by NOEL HUNT

For the past half-century the liberal, the man of goodwill, the *bien pensant*, together with his equally terrifying female counterpart, has dominated Western thought. Because the environment of Western man has been transformed the liberal holds that, as a result, the nature of man has changed with it. Man is said to have become better as his environment improved. As a result, it is argued, we can safely relax the rules which centuries of experience tell us are necessary if Caliban is to be kept in his cave. Thus we have the Permissive Society, with hardly any rules at all. This is hailed as "progress". The view that it is not progress at all, but merely change, is unfashionable and universally derided.

It is an article of faith with liberals that every man and woman everywhere must have a vote, and must be allowed to cast it once every five years or so. This is known as "democracy", and is acclaimed as one of "mankind's" greatest achievements. In time, the liberal believes, the regular and universal use of the vote will bring about Utopia. He clings to this view in spite of the lessons of history and of daily experience.

The juster view that universal suffrage is not democracy but ochlocracy, and merely ensures mob rule, is never allowed to be expressed. The liberal dogma is so powerful that the shibboleth of "one

man, one vote" has become universal outside the Russian Empire.

Governments are judged to be "good" or "bad" depending entirely on the width of the franchise. The fact that counting heads rather than their contents has brought endless misery to millions is blandly ignored. Whether a given people want it or not, whether it is suited to their mental and psychological make-up or not, the liberal insists that "democracy" shall prevail. He is unmoved by the fact that "democracy" has given Britain and America widespread disregard for the law, ever-growing public violence, racial tensions and strife, together with a crushing burden of taxation. His remedy for these ills is not less democracy, but more. Not content with the havoc which he has wrought in the West, the liberal turns his attention to other races in other continents. The results so far have been even more disastrous there than in Europe.

These gloomy reflections are prompted by the sorry spectacle presented today by Haiti, the Phillipines and Uganda, to name only three. Even more depressing is the remedy which the liberal proposes for the troubles of these countries. Predictably, it is more "democracy".

There are no whites in Haiti. There are a few Chinese who, as usual, stubbornly and sensibly refuse

to inter-marry with other races. About five per cent of the population are mulattoes, hating and hated by the blacks. These blacks are the descendants of slaves brought from all over Africa, Negro, Negroid, Hamitic and Nilotic. For a while, and under white rule, Haiti flourished. The blacks took over during the French Revolution. The history of Haiti ever since has been a record of one political disaster after another. Things got so bad that for many years the island was occupied and administered by the United States.

The Chinese have never been notable for their devotion to universal suffrage. The aboriginal Indian inhabitants had never heard of such a lunatic idea. The African Negro has no tradition of "democracy". It is a concept peculiar to the Nordic peoples. Thus none of the races whose descendants go to make up the modern population of Haiti have any tradition of, or experience in, universal suffrage.

Yet the liberalistic West insists that, having rid themselves of one bunch of corrupt and incompetent rulers, the luckless Haitians shall be compelled to give everyone a vote in the elections to choose another who can only be equally corrupt and incompetent. Nothing in the history of any of the races living in Haiti suggests that Western democratic ideas have the slightest chance of producing good government among Haitians.¹ The liberal is unmoved: let every person be given a vote, he insists, and let that vote be used at intervals. Common sense, ethnology and history all tell us that only misery and chaos lie ahead for the Haitians. The liberal cares for none of these things: let the people vote!

The riots, widespread looting and public killings recently seen in Haiti are described to us as the natural reaction of the people to the long misrule of the Duvalier family. They are nothing of the sort. They are the behaviour of a people left free to act entirely as they please. For that matter, the behaviour of Papa Doc, and the son who succeeded him, was not due to megalomania, paranoia or any of the other reasons advanced by sociologists. Both of them were simply acting true to type.

In the Philippines, nothing is left of white rule except a few genes in the racial mixture. Chinese and Vietnamese are super-imposed on a sub-stratum of Negroids and Negritos. None of these racial groups has any tradition of popular self-government, or any experience of universal suffrage. Neither in Haiti nor in the Philippines has any attempt been made in the West to find out if there are sufficient suitable men to form a decent government, still less to ensure that they are elected. All that the liberal requires is, now that Marcos has gone, that everyone shall cast a vote in fresh elections. The fact that neither the

electors nor the candidates have ever known honest and competent administration does not worry the man of goodwill. The unfortunate Filipino must choose a "democratic" set of rules in a "democratic" way, no matter how disastrous the results. No Filipino government has yet been anything but a corrupt and unprincipled set of gangsters. This means nothing to the man of goodwill. So long as everyone has a vote he feels that all must be well.

Uganda Tradition

The same sorry tale is repeated in Uganda. The Negroid population of Uganda have no tradition of universal suffrage. Like all Negroid peoples in Africa they have always been ruled by their tribal chiefs and elders. It is a system which evolved in Africa to suit the African mentality. One would think, therefore, that the West would pause before insisting on the adoption of other ideas. But this is not the case. Every Ugandan is to have a vote, whether he wants one or not. He will use it, too: the local power-seekers are adept at intimidation and will see to that. One tribe will eventually emerge as dominating the resultant farce, which will hastily be described by the West as a government. African governments must be tribal, for to the African the only real people in the world are those of his own tribe and totem. The rest of humanity are, at best, neutral non-persons. There is nothing wrong with such a point of view, of course, though it is not that of the West. Trouble only arises when the man of goodwill is allowed to ignore such racial differences and to persist in treating the Negro as if he were a Yorkshireman. It is this sort of thinking by lovers of what they describe as "mankind" which has inflicted on the world a total of human suffering and anguish which would have shocked Attila the Hun.

History tells us that the Westminster system of government originated in England. It also tells us that if the system is to function properly certain things are essential. These are first a homogeneous population, headed by a Monarch, advised by his hereditary councillors, working together with the elected representatives of the people. Many of England's troubles today arise from her abandonment of these essentials. It seems that the Westminster system can be made to work by other peoples of the same racial background as ourselves. There is no evidence that the system can function satisfactorily when imposed upon, for instance, Mongoloid or Negroid peoples. In fact the evidence is that it cannot. Yet this is precisely what the liberal insists must happen at all costs.

The man of goodwill is assisted in getting his way by the fact that all such regimes are bolstered by massive financial aid from the West. Yet most of the countries on which such aid is lavished lack both the administrative machinery necessary to use it and the honest and efficient staff to administer it. Thus most of it tends to end up in Swiss bank accounts.

In extreme cases of peculation of aid and gross mis-government the liberal will attempt to put matters right by the secondment of "experts" and "international civil servants" to the suffering country. This never works, as we have seen so often. The reason is that the "experts" are a cross-section of the "world community". Most of the "world community" has convincingly demonstrated its incapacity for efficient and honest administration.

To any dispassionate observer it seems clear that the very last thing Haiti, the Philippines or Uganda need is more "democracy". What they desperately need is a couple of generations of firm, honest and disinterested rule by men resembling those who staffed the old Indian Civil Service and the Colonial Service. Such men, despite what believers in human equality may believe, are to be found almost exclusively in a small racial group of the "world community". In general, the British, the Germans and Americans of Anglo-Saxon stock find bribery and public corruption abhorrent. They are almost alone in feeling like this. They also set high store on integrity and efficiency in public affairs. Again, they are almost alone in doing so. Those who could set matters right in Haiti, the Philippines and Uganda can only be drawn from this small racial group.³ By the same token only the West has conceived the essentially aristocratic idea of honest, disinterested and self-less public service.

So if we wish the peoples of Haiti, Uganda and the Philippines well we must jettison the liberal poppycock which has done so much harm everywhere. In its place we must install a set of alien but honest and competent rulers. It is a pity that this will certainly be rejected as being a "racialistic" solution. Though how what is in fact a racial problem can be solved other than in a racial manner is not clear. It is unfortunate for two reasons. One is that until it is done the agonies of the countries mentioned will continue. The other is that under such a benevolent dictatorship the need for "foreign aid" would dwindle rapidly as firm and honest administration set matters to rights. The Western tax-payer would benefit.³

The grip of the liberal on our affairs is probably too strong to be broken. So people like the Filipinos, the Haitians, the Ugandans and many others will continue to suffer as the pitiless and myopic liberal

tries to force widely differing human stocks into his Procrustean bed of "equality".

It must have been the thought of the enormous amount of human misery brought about by liberal beliefs which made Malcolm Muggeridge remark, and how truly, that "liberalism will be seen historically as the great destructive force of our time : much more so than Communism, Fascism, Nazism, or any other of the lunatic creeds which make such immediate havoc. Compared with the long-term consequence of a Gilbert Murray, a Bertrand Russell, a Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Hitler was an ineffective dreamer, Stalin a Father Christmas and Mussolini an Arcadian shepherd".

Editor's Notes

1. Western democratic ideas have not produced good government *anywhere*.
2. Why leave out the French? And what about Salazar and Franco?
3. As the recent granting of American "aid" to the Irelands makes of the United Kingdom a part of the Third World (with as yet only one "integral part waiting open-mouthed), we can be sure the Unionist prognostications will not be long unfulfilled. Isn't there something about the piper and the tune?

CHUNNEL TROUBLE

This interesting letter appeared in the **Portsmouth News** on January 31st: "In 1898 we left South Wales. My dad was all set to build the Channel Tunnel from Shakespeare Cliff, Dover, but they found coal so we called it a colliery. The company went broke so we returned to South Wales, but returned to Dover in 1902, and my dad built the breakwater at Dover Harbour. About 30 years ago he told me he would never see the tunnel built and neither would I. He said no one would find the answer to the shifting shale at the base of the English Channel."

Read SPEARHEAD

Edited by John Tyndall

Send 63p for a sample copy to:

P.O. BOX 446, LONDON SE23 2LS.

A MAN OF MANY PARTS

A SPECIAL REPORT FROM BONN BY
WILLIAM HENDERSON

It was not a neo-Nazi or, indeed, a real Nazi who wrote that Adolf Hitler, alias Schickelgruber, had a Jewish father, but none other than a Jew, namely the author John Toland, in his book **Adolf Hitler**, published by Doubleday and co., Inc., of New York in 1976. On page four of that book we find the following: "There is the slight possibility that Hitler's grandfather was a wealthy Jew named Frankenberger or Frankenreither, that Maria Anna (Hitler's mother) had been a domestic in this Jewish household at Graz and the young son got her pregnant".

So much for Hitler's Jewish progeny. No doubt we shall never know the truth. But according to recent reports in the West German press, we now know fully about the Jewish background of former West German Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt. The best report so far, and there have been many on Schmidt's Jewish background as well as his Nazi one, comes from the Russian German author and historian, Dr. Nikolaus von Preradovich, writing in the **National Zeitung** editions of July 5th and August 9th, 1985. The caption to the first article runs as follows: "Helmut Schmidt's 'Jüdische Abstammung' — Was ist wahr an seinen Erzählung?" (Helmut Schmidt's 'Jewish origin' — what is the truth about his announcement?). Von Preradovich refers briefly to the British author Jonathan Carr's book, **Helmut Schmidt — Helmsman of Germany**, which this writer has not read.

However, before proceeding with the article mentioned above from the **National Zeitung**, we can briefly review Schmidt's career when he took over from Willy Brandt, alias Herbert Frahm, as Chancellor way back in 1974, after Brandt had fallen, through involvement, with a Soviet spy. To pause a moment, it is worth noting that Brandt has not changed any, for according to a report in the German newsletter **Vertrauliche Mitteilungen — aus Politik und Wirtschaft**, Brandt celebrated the end of World War II, in May of last year, in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn, at an end-of-war festivity.

When Schmidt jumped onto the platform where Brandt 'fell' off, he created quite a stir. To begin with, Schmidt the social democrat was hailed to be the maker where Brandt had been the theorist. Helmut, as his friends affectionately called him, was very popular. The great mass of the workers, both white and blue-collar, echoed a chorus: "Schmidt is

a good Chancellor." But the opposition saw it differently: "He'll get us a bad name . . . can't he work in silence? . . . he reminds one a little of Hitler," and so it went. Schmidt began to brag! Germany, he cried, is the strongest economy in Europe and the second strongest in the world. He screeched what appeared to be new, just two simple words, "modell Deutschland". Look them up and there those two same words are, standing in **The Communist Manifesto** by Karl Marx. Schmidt loved to speak before a large crowd. He did a world tour, continued to shout, "modell Deutschland" and was rebuked by the Bavarian leader, Josef Strauss, for having brought in a flood of immigrants from the Third World countries, all looking for "modell Deutschland".

It is worth pausing here to reflect that in the mid-1970s Schmidt seemed to attract the attention of Wall Street, for who dropped in to see him, and spoke before a rather large public assembly in Bonn? None other than the late Nelson Rockefeller. He praised Schmidt and sang a chorus of salutation about social democracy (which is what the German socialists now call themselves) with these words: "doing the most for the very greatest majority". It reminds this writer of Mrs. Thatcher saying that Gorbachov was the kind of man she could work with when he visited the UK in the spring of 1985.

Mystery Of His Grandfather

Turning now to von Preradovich's article, we learn for the first time about the real Helmut Schmidt. During the Third Reich, said Schmidt, he had to be careful about family background, for the simple reason that his grandfather was a Jew.

Because Schmidt belonged to the "workers" party, it was generally put around that his grandfather had been a dock-worker. In particular it suited the SPD's picture book to show grandfather a dock-worker, father a school-teacher, and son as . . . German Chancellor. Dr. von Preradovich's article states that Schmidt's grandfather was a door-to-door salesman, a spiv. But he also poses the question: "Was grandfather out of the famous Hamburg banker family of Warburg?" Schmidt tried very hard to impress upon the populace his neo-Germanism, featuring a new and brilliant age in post-war Germany. The article goes on to tell how he joined the Hitler Youth in the

1930s as state service, and from that group he became a first lieutenant and was soon posted to the Eastern Front and served in the German EKII in the Aviation Division in administration. The report states that Schmidt did not receive the slightest wound on the Eastern Front. Not yet 25 years of age, he was then transferred to the Reich's Ministry of Aviation Training Division. In 1944 he was taken prisoner by the British Army, for by now he was on the Western Front.

From 1945 to 1949 Schmidt studied economics at the University of Hamburg. He completed his studies with a diploma and was thus declared an economist. In 1946 he joined the SPD. From 1947 to 1948 our comrade became the chairman of the committee of the German socialist students association. By 1949 he was the protege of Professor, and former National Socialist, Karl Schiller in the Hamburg Economics and Transport department. At the age of thirty, Schmidt became boss of this department, and as the report states, from then on there was no stopping him. From 1953 to 1963, he fulfilled many roles. From 1961 to 1965 he was domestic minister-senator of Hamburg. From 1965 he was back in the Bundestag and soon pulled himself into the mainstream of his own party, until by 1969 he arrived at the position of deputy chairman and then chairman of the SPD. We know the rest of the story. 1974 saw our Helmut as Chancellor and in October 1982 out he went as top man.

The fact is, as von Preradovich states, that Schmidt had nothing in common with the workers. He was an economist who did not even know the price of a pound of butter. Throughout the whole of his career he had not spent one day as an ordinary man. He spoke in the London Parliament at the invitation of Harold Wilson, fancied his chances with the aristocratic Giscard d'Estaing, didn't like Thatcher and supported Carter when it was clear that Reagan had already made it! His later cry was "Better 5% inflation than 5% unemployment." As he left office, both were higher than 5%. When he smiles, says the report, you are reminded of Mac the Knife, the shark! The small man from the big city has gone.

Today Schmidt is the joint manager with Dr. Marion Graf von Donhoff (the Duchess Donhoff) of the 'intellectual' pro-Zionist weekly socialist paper, **Die Zeit**. Schmidt also travels a great deal, according to the report. His New York agency manager was asking twenty thousand dollars per appearance. And last but not least when Schmidt was in New York in 1984, when asked about his Hitler Youth past career he replied, and the **New York Times** printed it, "My grandfather was a Jew." (**National Zeitung**, 9/8/85).

WHAT PRICE TORY?

Telephones, a give-away,
Profit millions to defray
Insatiable a need
Of money makers' greed.

Oil and Water, Gas to boot
Earmarked to become more loot,
So subtle the disguise,
The word is 'Privatise'.

Hold Ordnance and Aeroplanes,
Mines and Motor Cars in chains
For foreign capital —
The Brits made minimal.

Channel Ferries priced so high
No mote this in private eye;
Railways first made derelict
Pre-empting "all change" edict.

Sabbath set to get the chop
Little man and corner shop,
That multi-store may perch
On pillar of the Church.

Sovereignty so long sold short
Corporations in cohort
Set-up the pilot scheme
For British run-down theme.

Thus, they dig a hole to France,
Kentish men, no second glance;
The sceptre somewhat bent
Towards the Continent.

What price Tory will not sell
Army, Navy, RAF as well?
perhaps, even intent
To bargain Parliament?

B. E. BIGGS.

MAY THEY REST IN PEACE

It is with deep regret that we record the death of **Mrs. Daphne Gordon-England**, who was aged 94. Her husband was an aviation pioneer and she was still doing stunts of flying herself up to 1984. She was of a breed we can hardly do without.

Another sad loss is **Mr. Frank Toombs**. A stalwart Loyalist, he rallied round indefatigably when **Candour's** Editor was electioneering for the LEL in 1964 in the Petersfield constituency. He was a faithful friend and we shall miss him.

CAUTIONARY ECONOMICS FOR EVERYMAN

by RICHARD MONTAGUE

A recent article in *Candour* on Ezra Pound reminded me that a particular Poundian complaint was against lack of directness and clarity in language. Pound strove throughout his literary maturity to render his feelings and ideas in as terse and powerful a manner as the great classical exemplars of the style. Pound's obsession with economy — if not sparseness — of expression led to his fascination with Chinese ideogrammic characters and, increasingly, to an actual obscurity of meaning in his poetry, the major corpus of which is replete with references to arcane historical and personal allusions. Lucidity of meaning is nowhere more necessary than when discussing the subject of economics; it is a subject which engages each and every one of us yet few feel competent to advance any arguments which run contrary to the prevailing orthodoxy. The high priests of establishment economics have woven a daunting liturgy around their idol in an effort to exclude the growing grumbings of discontent with the system expressed by the disaffected layman.

Any rational discussion or appreciation of a subject must commence with agreement of definition. Definitions should be expressed in plain language which makes no distraction from exactness of meaning. Writing for his 16-year-old niece, in 1924 Hilaire Belloc had published *Economics For Helen* in which he set out, in the simplest terms, the meaning of such concepts as 'wealth', 'money', 'socialism', 'communism' and 'usury', besides giving an admirable account of the rise of banking power.

What is 'wealth'? Belloc wrote, "Wealth is never properly defined, for the purposes of economic study, by any one of the answers a person would naturally give off-hand. For instance, most people would say that a man's wealth was the money he was worth. But that, of course, is nonsense; for even if there were no money used, his possessions would still be there, and if he had a house and cattle and horses the mere fact that money was not being used where he lived would not make him any worse off.

"Another and better, but still a wrong, answer is 'wealth is what a man possesses. For instance, in the case of this farmer, his house and his stock and his furniture and his implements are what we call his 'wealth'. In ordinary talk that answer will do well enough. But it will not do for the strict science of economics, for it is not accurate.

"For consider a particular case. Part of this man's wealth is, you say, a certain grey horse. But if you look closely at your definition and make it rigidly accurate, you will find that *it is not the horse itself which constitutes his wealth, but something attaching to the horse*, some quality or circumstance which affects the horse and gives the horse what is called its *value*. It is this *value* which is wealth, not the horse." If there were a dearth of horses the value of this farmer's horse would rise, yet his horse would not have changed. We would say that his horse was 'worth more'. "It is this worth that is, this ability to get other wealth in exchange, which constitutes true economic wealth."

He summed up the foregoing in two formulae:

1. Wealth is made up, not of things, but of economic values attaching to things.
2. Wealth, for the purposes of economic study, means *only* exchange values; that is, values against which other values will be given in exchange.

Having defined wealth he goes on to a discussion of the ingredients necessary for its creation: land, labour and capital.

Printing Paper Money

Having been created, how is the exchange of wealth facilitated? This is done by *money*, which is *not* wealth but a medium of exchange. However, money does not only fill this main function of being a medium of exchange but is also used as a measure of the economic values attaching to goods, expressed in terms of money; that is, *prices*.

"Now with the beginnings of modern industry . . . a vastly greater number of things began to be made than had ever been made before, and the number of exchanges multiplied ten, twenty and a hundredfold. The stock of gold, though it had increased in the nineteenth century by discoveries in Australia and California, and later in South Africa, would have been quite unable to cope with this flood of new work, and prices would have fallen very much indeed, had it not been for the creation of *paper money*. Paper money was a method of greatly increasing efficiency in circulation.

"This is how it workel: A bank or a government (but especially the Bank of England, with the guarantee of the government) would print pieces of paper with the words: 'I promise to pay to the bearer of this Five Pounds'. Anyone who took one of these pieces of paper to the Bank of England could get five golden sovereigns. But since this was publicly known, people were willing to take the piece of paper *instead of the five sovereigns*.

"Because people were willing to be paid in paper instead of in the actual gold, a large number of notes could be kept in circulation at any one time, and only a small amount of gold had to be kept in readiness at the Bank to redeem them. In practice, it was found that very much less gold than the notes stood for was quite enough to meet the notes as they were brought in for payment. Much the most of the note circulation went on going the rounds, and in normal times it took a long time for a note on the average to be brought back to the Bank. You can see that this dodge of paper money had the effect of increasing the total amount of the current medium in practice, and of greatly increasing its efficiency in circulation . . . *So long as every note was redeemed in gold every time it was brought to the bank, so long as the promise to pay was promptly kept, the money still remained good; the paper currency did not interfere with the reality of the gold values, there was no upsetting of prices, and all went well.*

"Unfortunately, governments are under a great temptation, when they have exceptionally heavy expenses, to falsify the currency. People get so much in the habit of trusting the government stamp on paper or metal that they take it as part of nature. What the government is really doing when it coins a sovereign is giving a guarantee that this little disk of metal contains 123 grains of gold with a certain known (and small) amount of alloy to make the gold hard. When the government has to pay a large amount in wages, or for its Army and Navy, or what not, it is tempted to put in less gold and more alloy and keep the old stamp unchanged, and that is called 'debasing the currency' . . . When these bad sovereigns get into circulation they naturally find their level in gold, for people begin to test them, and find that they have not got as much gold in them as they pretend to have. Then, of course, prices as measured in this new base coin rise . . . Again it (the government) is tempted to put even less gold into the coins . . . and so the coin gets baser and baser, until at last, perhaps, a sovereign will not really be worth half what it pretends to be. Governments in the past have done this over and over again, but it was not until our time that the worst form of debasing the coinage came in . . .

"This last and worst form of debasing coinage worked, not through cheating about the metal, but through a trick played with paper money . . . When the government had very heavy expenses to meet on account of the war, they first began making difficulties about paying when people brought their paper to the bank, and at last stopped paying altogether. At the same time, they did everything they could to get the gold out of private people's hands and to make them use paper money instead. The consequence was that people, being so accustomed to think of a paper guarantee of the government exactly as though it were real money, readily took to the new notes and used them as money, thinking of these wretched bits of paper exactly as though they were so many golden sovereigns. The government could go on printing as many bits of paper as it liked, and they would still be used as though they were real money. So long as the amount of paper printed was not more than would have been printed when the notes were redeemable, and when the currency was on a true 'gold basis', no harm was done; but of course it paid the government to go on printing a great many more notes than that, because, when it could make money thus cheaply, it could pay for anything, however great the expense; but at the cost, of course, of debasing the currency more and more.

"Of the different European fighting countries, ours did best in this matter . . . With the Germans, their currency has quite gone to pieces; a paper coin in Germany is worth (at the time I write, October 1923) *ten million* times less than the real metal coin which it is supposed to represent." This practice Belloc rightly characterised as "swindling".

Political Applications

Turning to the political applications of economic theory, he outlines the three forms of political-economic organisation of which man has had experience, summarising them thus:

"1. The Servile State: that is, the state in which the material means of production are the property of men who also own the human agents of production.

"2. The Capitalist State: that is, the state in which the material means of production are the property of a few, and the numerous human agents of production are free, but without property.

"3. The Distributive State: that is, the state in which the material means of production are owned by the free human agents of production.

"There is also a fourth imaginary kind of state which has never come into being, called the Socialist or Communist State."

He faults capitalism and slavery, champions distributism and dismisses socialism and communism (arguing that the former inevitably leads to the latter) on the grounds that they require the suppression of certain ineradicable human traits — like the reluctance to bend individual will to the direction of the state — and are therefore, as systems, impracticable. “That is why, I think, socialism has never been put into practice and never can be put into practice. There have been attempts at it, but even when they are sincere and not the mere product of alien despotism they break down. As in Russia today, where, whether the Jew adventurers who seized power were sincere or mere tyrants, they have, in spite of their attempt at seizing all the soil and keeping the peasants dependent on them, been compelled at last to let nearly all the nation live as owners tilling their own land.”

Belloc traces the development of banking power from the days when people would place their gold and other valuables for safekeeping in the hands of gold and silversmiths. He notes how the custodians of this money soon realised that only a fraction of their clients' deposits would be drawn upon at any given time. This opened the way for the bankers to lend non-existent money (the extension of credit) on a scale disproportionate to the actual monies deposited with them, a process culminating, over time, with the banks taking to themselves the power to print and issue promissory notes (which aren't), bearing only a notional relation to reserves, a dodge which is responsible for the banks today owning much of the real wealth of the world.

The Meaning Of Usury

Usury is an economic abuse which was condemned and anathematised for centuries, yet is little spoken of today. It is a measure of the fraudulent nature of much of received economics that the concept of usury is nowhere mentioned in any of the many worthless textbooks on 'economics' readily available for purposes of obfuscation from our high street bookshops. If asked to define 'usury' most people would say that it is the charging of excessive interest on a loan. In fact, “usury *has nothing to do with high or low interest*. Usury is the taking of any interest whatever upon an *unproductive* loan.”

The example Belloc cites is of a temporarily unemployed man asking a baker to lend his hungry family half a dozen loaves for a few days until he can earn some money with which to replace the loaves. If the baker were to reply, 'I will not let you

have half a dozen loaves on those terms. I will let you owe me the bread for a month if you like, but at the end of the month you must give me back *seven* loaves', *that* would be usury. “The man is not using the loan productively; he is consuming the loaves immediately. No more wealth is created by the act. The world is not the richer, nor is the baker the richer, nor is society in general the richer. No more wealth at all has appeared through the transaction. Therefore, the extra loaf being claimed is claimed out of nothing. It has to come out of the wealth of the community — in this particular case out of the wealth of the man who borrowed the loaves — instead of coming out of an increment or excess of new wealth. That is why usury is called 'usury' — which means 'wearing down', 'gradually dilapidating'. The test is whether the loan is productive or not. The intention of usury is present when the money is lent at interest on what the lender knows will be an unproductive purpose, and the actual practice of usury is present when the loan, having as a fact been used unproductively, interest is none the less demanded.”

Works on honest economics, regrettably, seem to be confined to second-hand bookshops where they have been consigned with a host of other forbidden subjects which, once alive in the earlier decades of this century, are today not spoken of. For the student of these puzzling times this body of literature constitutes a type of *samizdat*, knowledge of which sheds insights into our present troubled state.

JUST WHAT THE USURER ORDERED

“Mr. Rockefeller, a former president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, arrived in the capital (Buenos Aires) on Saturday to preside over the opening meeting of the Society of the America.

“He last visited Argentina in 1980, when he was given an extremely warm reception from the military regime then in power and praised its economic policies.

“Under the regime, Argentina's foreign debts grew from £5,500 million in 1976 to about £35,000 million.”

— **Daily Telegraph**, January 15, 1986.

SPOTLIGHT ON "PIK" BOTHA

by S. E. D. BROWN

What is the P.W. Botha Government now going to do about fighting *all* the *real* enemies of their own race, nation and civilisation, namely, the unholy trinity of Communism, World Zionism and International Finance? The answer is, very little or nothing, apart from continuing to use our highly efficient and highly dedicated Police and Defence Forces to fight, and to contain, the "aggressive acts" of world Communism, namely, those of SWAPO and the ANC, inside South Africa and on our borders. In their bland acceptance of the policy of "no confrontation" with black and white enemies, as long as they "renounce violence" and "behave themselves", our Government has now accepted an underlying fact of American foreign policy, namely, that South Africa, just like the US, has committed itself to check *only* the "externally aggressive" and "internally aggressive" acts of Communism — which means that South Africa is no longer opposed to Communism as an ideology. But there can be no such thing as a "brand" of Communism which is not "externally aggressive", for Communism, as anyone who has bothered to study it knows, is dedicated, just as is world Zionism, to world revolution and to world domination, by any means possible — that is their ideology! It is, therefore, no longer a question of whether the P.W. Botha Government is going to fight *all* the *real* enemies of our race and civilisation, but rather now a question of what we, as a beleaguered White nation, have to go on expecting from our State President and from his Foreign Minister, Mr. R. F. "Pik" Botha — both of whom have turned their backs on their own White nation and its sovereignty, and whose "reforms" and new multiracial constitution mark their final surrender and sell-out to the collectivist forces of the communist world revolution.

But how fortuitous for their global aims to have in South Africa a Foreign Minister who in his maiden speech in Parliament in 1970 called on Parliament and the South African people to accept and identify themselves with the "Human Rights" of the UN Charter. This is the same Mr. "Pik" Botha who, since then, has played an active and leading role in bringing South Africa giant steps closer to identification with his much-cherished UN Declaration of Human Rights. His views in 1970 had the full backing of the Vorster Government at the time, and in which Government our State President, Mr. P. W.

Botha, was then the Minister of Defence. But, in his new-found fervour for the UN's Declaration of Human Rights, Mr. "Pik" Botha did not seem to know, or care, that the Zionist and Communist master planners of the UN had seen to it that there was no Declaration of Human *Responsibilities* — and furthermore, that the Human Right in the UN Declaration are the "human rights" envisaged within the framework of Marxist doctrine, which regards man primarily as an economic animal. Mr. "Pik" Botha, we were to assume, also had no quarrel with Article 16 of that Declaration, which specifies that every man and woman, having reached the age of majority, must have the right to marry anyone they choose and have children, irrespective of race or colour. In short, meaning that Mr. Botha had accepted the principle of marriage between White and Black.

Foundation Of Communism

Whether Mr. "Pik" Botha knew it or not, he was clearly basing his policy on the assumption that racial differences are skin deep: namely, that whereas the Black African differs from the White European in the breadth and depth of his civilisation, there are no genetic or native factors to account for these differences; that all races are potentially equal in mental ability and differ only in their opportunity to achieve; and that belief in racial differences and the maintenance of racial pride, racial self-respect and integrity, implies "superiority" and "inferiority", and as such is shameful and reprehensible! This view that, except for environmental differences, all races are fundamentally equal, has been called the equalitarian dogma. It is ardently supported with rhetoric and emotion, but without any factual evidence whatever. This equalitarian dogma, moreover, is the foundation theory of Liberalism, Socialism and of Communism itself. But Mr. "Pik" Botha, a dyed-in-the-wool liberal and pragmatist, and long a ventriloquist dummy of the US State Department's "liberal" policies, would not concern himself with such things.

This is the same "Pik" Botha whose appointment as South Africa's new Foreign Minister was greeted with delight and undisguised enthusiasm at the UN and in every Leftist quarter of the world. His "final triumph", at the time of his departure from America

as South Africa's ambassador at the UN was his personal meeting with America's President Carter. Furthermore, his official farewell party in Washington was attended by Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State, William Schauffele, then head of the State Department's Africa Bureau, and other State Department officials who, with Mr. Botha, had played a major part in the Rhodesian negotiations leading to the final surrender of Rhodesia by Ian Smith. These good friends of Mr. Botha obviously knew that if there was one man who could right the "injustices in South Africa" which "were justifiably irritating our international allies" and the whole world, that man was Mr. "Pik" Botha. Thereafter, he maintained friendly and very close ties with Henry Kissinger, always heeding his advice and openly urging South Africans to do the same!

In 1983 Mr. "Pik" Botha even went so far as to defend publicly Henry Kissinger in the South African Parliament, as a man "who has received honorary medals from the most conservative institutions in the US"; a man who in his actions vis-a-vis Russia "was even firmer and more conservative than the present American Government!" The true picture of Henry Kissinger, however, was quite different. The key to his meteoric "success" was that throughout every stage of his growing authority in the past, Henry Kissinger worked tirelessly and brilliantly to advance the Communist cause, the Zionist cause, and the global aspirations of International Finance. For this he possessed all the attributes required for the greatest progress and the greatest accomplishments of these global forces, in their drive to impose their one-world tranny on the total population of the earth. In his ruthless climb to power and his brazen use of such "big lies" as the claim that he was promoting world peace, Henry Kissinger was a deceptive and cunning traitor, every step of the way, to his adopted country, the United States, to the Christian West and its civilisation; and peoples of every country in the world.

As for the Council on Foreign Relations, which Mr. "Pik" Botha also went out of his way in Parliament to cover up for, and to praise, this is the highly subversive organisation which has for long been identified as the invisible government of the US. Its membership of collectivist one-worlders has long been carrying out a secret revolutionary purpose, embracing the US and the world, without making any attempt to tell the American people, or the people of the world, what it is doing, or asking their consent. The agencies of the CFR are the tax-exempt American Foundations, the CIA, the UN, Unesco, the

World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and all the other specialised internationalist UN agencies. The CFR functions in concert with allied internationalist organisations such as the Bilderbergers, the Trilateralists, the Royal Institute of International Affairs and allied organisations in other countries, including South Africa, such as the SA Institute of International Affairs. The aim of the CFR is the same as that of international Communism and world Zionism, namely, to create a "one-world collectivist state, with the US as part of it.

World Power Structure

Mr. "Pik" Botha has never seemed to know, or to care in the least, that Soviet Communism and political Zionism sprang from a common root in the ghettos of Russia, and that they are only as separate as two main branches of the same tree. Backed to the full by International Finance their purpose is to denationalise all races, nations and governments, and to erect on the break-up of Western Christian civilisation their collectivist New World Order. Their organisation and political instrument is the United Nations Organisation — whose Charter has accurately been identified as a formulation of the Soviet totalitarian system into an international idiom, adapted to Western ways of thinking and modes of procedure. This is one and the same UN to which our Foreign Minister has long been dedicated! Not at all surprising, then, was the effusive, banner-headlined article in the influential, far-left **Washington Post** of March 20th, 1984, headed: "Pik Botha Has Leading Role In South Africa's Policy Changes." The article went on to praise Mr. Botha as the South African Government's chief spokesman and representative in "the new peace initiatives with South Africa's Marxist neighbours . . . including Mozambique." This is the same Mr. Botha who then told Whites at a meeting in Phalaborwa last year "*not to fear stepping out on a trek into the unknown*" and to do so in the interests of "peace" and "stability", because he and the P.W. Botha Government "were inspired by Christian convictions, and not by pressures from the outside world"!

This is one and the same Mr. "Pik" Botha who long has manipulated the country's internal and external policies, as well as the State President himself. He is today in almost complete control of policy making in the South African Cabinet. He has, furthermore, gained complete control over the South African Broadcasting Corporation and its radio and



"PIK" BOTHA WITH AN ISRAELI ENVOY

television services. The SABC, itself, is systematically being purged of conservatives; and its higher echelons are packed with Mr. "Pik" Botha's like-minded, "liberal" cronies. The SABC has been ordered to stop all genuine anti-Communist propaganda, and to cease criticising the Left. Conservative groups and publications are constantly harrassed and given the silent treatment. The SABC today is being used in a comprehensive and systematic mind-conditioning campaign, to programme the electorate to accept "change" and eventual black majority rule.

Phenomenon Of Our Times

And what do we, as Whites in South Africa, stand to gain when, and if, the P.W. Botha Government's politics of "reform" and change are fully implemented? When we are finally prised away from "racial discrimination" and stripped of our nationhood and sovereignty, well . . . we shall still have the promises of phenomenal prosperity just around the corner and, of course, the "peace" and multi-racial bliss to come from black majority rule, just as in Rhodesia. And all this to come from the Harry Oppenheimers, the Anton Ruperts and the Jan S. Maraises and their kind, and from their over-lords, the Rothschilds and the Rockefellers and their international financial ilk.

We have seen in Africa, and elsewhere in the world, in one country after another, how White nations and communities have come to acquiesce in concessions and policies which are contrary to their own interests and their national survival, and which have gone down one by one. This outstanding phenomenon, with the breath-taking speed of its

advance, is largely attributable to the apathy and the failure of the people concerned to perceive in which direction their leaders are taking them. This is precisely what is happening in South Africa, where so many of our people cannot perceive in which direction they are being led, by leaders who have turned their backs on a lifetime of conservative principles and policies in order to adapt themselves to those of the enemies of their race and civilisation. For this reason we say again that unless the two Bothas and their fellow liberal revolutionaries are thrown out of power in double quick time, and unless responsible and conservative leadership is quickly restored, the White nation is doomed, and headed for certain destruction.

S. E. D. Brown is editor of The South African Observer, PO Box 2401, Pretoria, South Africa. Airmail subscription rate to UK: £11.50.

MANDELA FOR PRESIDENT?

Mr. "Pik" Botha received what **The Daily Telegraph's** Cape Town correspondent called a "reprimand" when he said that it was "inevitable" that South Africa one day would have a Black President. The prediction was made in an address to foreign correspondents on the development of "power-sharing" in South Africa. "Any speculation about future presidents is purely hypothetical," cautioned the State President, Mr. P. W. Botha, who nevertheless had himself declared only a few days before that apartheid was "an out-dated concept". The President said he wished to state unequivocally that any speculation or discussion regarding constitutional situations in no way represented official policy.

The resemblance between what is happening in South Africa and what occurred in Rhodesia and Kenya is uncanny. Clearly, the same devious policies and tricks are being re-worked. And how similar the situation is to that prevailing in the Roman Catholic Church shortly before Vatican II. Disquieted Catholics, fearful of the growing spirit of revolt, asked for and were given assurances about the traditional customs and morals of the Church, only to find them cast aside in the turmoil that followed the liberal assault that marked the Second Vatican Council's proceedings. History has a habit of repeating itself only because almost nobody learns from it.

THE VICTIM OF VENGEANCE

by COLIN JORDAN

As part of its 1986 Spring Season, the Harrogate Theatre is staging Michael Burrell's play **Hess**. In it, we hear what it is supposed Hess might say, given the opportunity, about himself and the world. The play is described as "riveting" in its publicity, which may or may not be true as this issue goes to press before we have had an opportunity to see it. What is patently in error in advertisements for the play is the labelling of Rudolf Hess, the solitary and dignified 91-year-old inmate of Spandau, as a "war-criminal", as Mr. Jordan has pointed out so clearly in an open letter to Mr. Andrew Manley, Artistic Director of the Harrogate Theatre — *Editor*.

"Dear Mr. Manley,

"I have your reply of 23rd January, 1986, in the matter of your forthcoming production entitled **Hess** in connection with which your advertising falsely describes him as a 'war criminal', and, while I have to thank you for making known your mind in this matter, I have also to make known to you how self-condemnatory that revelation is . . .

"At one and the same time you seek to invoke the authority of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in condemnation of Rudolf Hess, while to your convenience dismissing as 'nit-picking' its own differentiation in its charges which was precisely what I cited to you in pointing out that the defendant was found *not* guilty of the charge of being a war criminal. That Tribunal tried Hess on four counts, these being (1) preparations for a war of aggression, (2) crimes against peace, (3) war crimes, and (4) crimes against humanity. With reference to the third of these, Allied Control Council Law No. 10 of 10th December, 1945, defined 'war crimes' as 'atrocities or offences against persons or property constituting violations of the laws or customs of war.' Hess was convicted on counts (1) and (2), but acquitted on counts (3) and (4). Your description of him as a 'war-criminal' is thus in disregard of the findings of the very court responsible for his imprisonment.

"Similarly, your accusation in your letter that Hess was 'a party' to decisions 'to exterminate the Jewish race' is refuted by the verdict of the Nuremberg Tribunal. Had he, in fact, been involved in any such decisions you can be quite sure that this Tribunal would not have failed to convict him under count (4) of crimes against humanity, defined by the same Allied Control Council Law already referred to as

including 'extermination' and 'other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds'. The fact that he was acquitted on this count disposes of your allegation, does it not?

"In view of this verdict it is not incumbent on me to enter into any controversy as to whether or not millions of Jews were 'exterminated', and I will accordingly —merely add that even the most ardent claimants of 'extermination' do not try to make out that it was in progress in May of 1941 when Rudolf Hess left Germany to try and save Britons and Germans from the consequences of continued conflict. Thus it was impossible for him to have been a party, as you allege, to such 'extermination'.

"Therefore, what I have here already said is sufficient to rebut your argument, and to establish the need for a correction of your advertising which should now be expected from you as a matter of course, unless it is that you are more concerned to contribute to untruthful propaganda.

Victors' Tribunal

"However, without any detriment to any preceding points, I would briefly make a few further ones destructive of your standpoint. The court which convicted Hess was a victors' tribunal, set up in the continuing passions of a war only just ended, and as such was a travesty of justice in that it concerned itself only with offences alleged against the vanquished, and ignored those on its own side — which I presume even you will concede did happen. It stands condemned not merely by this general partiality, but by specific one that its judges included none other than the man who had been in charge of Stalin's show trials, namely I. T. Nikitchenko, representative of a country which had been expelled from the League of Nations for its aggression against Finland in 1939, and which had held more people in concentration camps and exterminated more opponents than any other in modern times. To have Hess convicted by a man like Nikitchenko can be likened only to the spectacle of an alcoholic magistrate falling off his chair in convicting a motorist for drunken driving, after having himself driven through a hedge on his way home from a party the previous evening.

"That was not all. The counts Hess was convicted on were retroactive innovations unknown both in German and in foreign penal codes; the court procedures were utterly at variance with those of British justice in the denial of any parity of facilities and expression to the defence; and, furthermore, false evidence was used to convict — as, for example, the Hossbach Protocol, introduced to prove that Hitler planned aggressive war, and thereby to convict Hess as a party to this. The eminent historian A. J. P. Taylor exposed this forgery . . . Need more be said to demonstrate that Hess' conviction was invalid? No really impartial court with fair practices would ever have convicted this innocent man.

"I close by inviting you to think again regarding your role as a party to the denigration of an old man of 91 who has thus wrongly spent 44 years behind bars as a victim of vengeance; and I hope that as a result I may shortly hear from you that you have decided to withdraw the false and offensive description of 'war-criminal' applied to him; otherwise I must, among a variety of measures of protest, report the matter to the Advertising Standards Authority forthwith."

THE MADNESS OF OUR AGE

While the rest of us are awash in tears about the Shuttle fiasco, the liberal harpies should be ecstatic. They succeeded in proving our young women can get killed just as dead as our young men! Even wild animals don't deliberately thrust their females into danger, but in our degeneracy and depravity, we do — and call it 'freedom' and 'progress'! I feel, of course, compassion for the survivors, but the fact is that all seven of these people were on an ego kick without regard to the consequences. As a result of their recklessness, they left eleven children orphaned, five widows and one widower. Because of this not a single one of them had any business whatever in being involved.

The really ironic thing about the Shuttle is that it was supposed to be the ultimate showcase on race and sex harmony: one black, one asiatic, one jew, two women and five men. Well, so much for integrated, co-educational space war! Back to the drawing board and keep on trying!

W. H. KELLY.

FOR FAMILY, COUNTRY AND TRADITION!

A new book of the greatest interest and value to Candour readers

When Elizabeth, Lady Freeman, first sent her **TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY** for me to read, she said that it was the collection she had made over the years in her commonplace book, and now the times being what they are, she would like to see it printed "for the sake of her grandchildren".

In an earlier Dark Age, it was the monasteries that held and safeguarded the accumulation of wisdom and truth neglected — if not abhorred — by contemporary marauders. Today, when it appears that Shangri-la exists only in the imagination of James Hilton, everybody's grandchildren will probably have to search for it among the forgotten contents of attics and second-hand bookshops, but with minds loaded with Establishment lies, as to ever greater extent they will be, they will not know what to look for unless provided with a key. This anthology of Elizabeth Freeman's choice is just such a key. It contains a collection of gems so excellent in themselves that they "make hungry where most [they] satisfy."

If the miracle we pray for is delayed, and the spiritual and physical vandalism of nations continues, may our children's children find, learn from and profit by the treasures of truth exemplified in this timely strong-book.

Advance orders accepted now

Publication date: Spring 1986

Price: £10 (U.K.) \$15 (U.S.A.) £12.50 (Rest of the world)

SOUNDS OF REVOLUTION

A. K. Chesterton often referred to the adverse effect of 'psychedelic', 'rock' and other forms of pop music. Ivor Benson, indeed, believes it to be 'an influence generated directly by Communism'. 'Pop', 'rocks', 'punk' — call it what you will — is undoubtedly the new international language. Black, brown, yellow and white youth worldwide writhes and pulses to its beat. Could it be a weapon of psychological warfare? If so, who are the controllers?

Plato knew a thing or two about this, to judge from this quotation from **The Republic**:

"The introduction of a new kind of music must be shunned as imperilling the whole state, for styles of music are never disturbed without affecting the most important political institutions . . . The new style, gradually gaining a lodgement, quietly insinuates itself into manners and customs, and from these it . . . goes on to attack laws and constitutions, displaying the utmost impudence, until it ends by overturning everything."

SPOTLIGHT ON GADAFI

"Muammar el-Qaddafi spent his childhood in a goatskin tent in the province of Fezzan, which Italy had ruled. According to the London **Times** of April 18, 1972, there is evidence that his mother was a Jewish woman of the Lingi family, in Benghazi, who married a desert tribesman from Cyrenaica in the early 1940s and became a Moslem."

— **H du B Reports**, February, 1986.

KEEP BRITAIN BRITISH

Like the **Sunday Express** on March 2nd, we think it's very odd that Edward Heath, who was so eager to give foreign bureaucrats in Brussels the right to make our laws, should now be so furious at the prospect of foreign car firms bidding for British Leyland. Of course, the traitor Heath does not want a *British* Leyland at all: a recent **Times** report stated he was urging "an attempt to develop a *European* arrangement which would allow Britain to maintain *some* control over the industry." Then there was Harold Musgrove of Austin Rover complaining on Radio Four's **Today** programme that under EEC rules Spain can now send 130,000 cars to Britain, whilst we can export only 4,500 to Spain! "Yes," he said, "it does seem as though Spain is exporting unemployment to Britain." So what on earth is the point of bleating "Keep Leyland British" or "Keep Westland British" unless first we act to make *Britain* British once again? Or is **Candour** just becoming more barbery in its old age?

PETITION TO THE QUEEN

May it please Your Majesty:

Some five thousand fellow Canadians have taken the trouble to read and sign the enclosed petition, in which we ask to be given the freedom to adopt the mode of measurement of our choice.

Most of us are veterans of World War II — the war that was fought, supposedly, to preserve such freedoms. But many younger people have joined our ranks to protest the forced imposition of metric measurement over the imperial measurement with which we grew up, and which to most of us is sacred.

Normally, we would have our grievances aired through your provincial representative, in this case the Honourable Helen Hunley, Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta. We have attempted to set up an appointment to present our petition, but she will have nothing to do with us. Therefore we take this opportunity to present our concerns to you, our Monarch and our Queen, directly.*

Please give ear to our concern. So many of our fellows died for the cause of freedom, for the very rights that we now see so rapidly eroding in our great country. They are no longer alive to sign this petition. Please remember that we are carrying the banner for them as well, in our hearts and minds.

We beg you to intercede on our behalf. Believe me, this is an issue close to the hearts and souls of many in this great land. It is close to the soul of the land itself.

Respectfully,
Captain James Goodwin (retired).

* *Alas, Her Majesty did nothing in response to the many petitions presented by the League of Empire Loyalists — Editor.*

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum
U.K. - -	£5.00
Overseas - -	£6.00 Airmail
U.S. Dollar Rate -	\$10.00 ..

F O R E S T H O U S E . L I S S F O R E S T . H A N T S G U S S 7 D D